



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#9/24/01  
AT FIVE  
27501  
K. [unclear]

Applicant: Kelan C. Silvester § Group Art Unit: 2645  
Serial No.: 09/189,250 §  
Filed: November 10, 1998 § Examiner: A. Hoosain  
For: Message Handling System § Atty. Dkt. No.: INTL-0154-US

Box AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington DC 20231

RECEIVED  
OCT 01 2001  
Technology Center 2600

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REJECTION**

Sir:

In response to the Advisory Action mailed on September 14, 2001, the Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

**Remarks**

Upon further review of the Pepe reference, the Applicant's attorney believes that there is a basis to definitively determine what Pepe is teaching. In the interest of avoiding an unnecessary appeal, the Applicant's attorney submits the following Supplemental Response to the Final Rejection.

✓ The basic question is whether the cited material in Pepe is teaching a system in which the subject of a voice message is converted into text and then sent by an e-mail. In Applicant's prior responses it was indicated that this was not the case. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner continues to assert that it is the case.

The language relied upon primarily in the office action relates it to cross-media notification. See column 20, lines 42-53. Cross-media notifications relate to both the situation where an e-mail is converted to a voice mail and a voice mail is converted to text. Thus, the cross-media notifications convert in both directions. For example, in column 35, lines 24-26, it is indicated that text information can be converted to synthesized speech (e-mail to voice).

Date of Deposit: 9/24/01  
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington DC 20231.  
Sharon V. Hart

The material relied upon the Examiner is talking about converting from e-mail to voice mail, as well as voice mail to e-mail. For example, in column 20, line 50 it talks about a voice mail and it also talks about an e-mail as the type of media. When the type of media is e-mail, then you are converting to voice mail, when the type of media is voice mail, then you are converting to e-mail.

The question remains with respect to the language at lines 52 and 53 of column 20, where it states that "if appropriate, the subject of the message" is included. It is respectfully submitted that this reference is to the situation where an e-mail, which necessarily has a subject, is being converted to a voice mail. That is what is meant by the phrase "if appropriate." If the message is an e-mail message with a subject, then it is converted into a voice message.

In a situation where the message is a voice mail that is converted into an e-mail, no subject is included. In column 28 at lines 15-23, Pepe specifically explains how you provide an e-mail indication that a voice mail is received. There, he refers to a notification containing (1) the mail box number that originated the voice message, (2) the date and time the message was received, and (3) the length of the voice mail message in minutes. Here, where Pepe is explicitly talking about the voice mail example, there is no mention of providing the subject. Therefore, it is necessarily clear that the material relied upon by the Examiner that states that the message subject may be provided, if appropriate, refers to the situation where the message is an e-mail message (being converted to voice mail) that necessarily has a subject.

Similarly, at column 27, lines 62-66, there is a reference to how you convert a voice message into an e-mail message, and, again, there is no mention of providing any subject information.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Pepe is very clear that it is only "in the appropriate case" that subject information is provided and that "appropriate case" is only the case where an e-mail message (that necessarily has a subject) is converted to a voice format.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

9/21/01



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop  
Registration No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77024  
(713) 468-8880 [Telephone]  
(713) 468-8883 [Facsimile]

RECEIVED  
OCT 01 2001  
Technology Center 2600